REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. No claims have been added, amended or canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Kamazawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Ryan et al.</u>; and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art (AAPA).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the outstanding Office Action indicates that the first embodiment does not expressly disclose that all m column electrodes are connected on common. However, although claim 1 recites that an address electrode includes t strip portions, not every strip portion belongs to the sole address electrode.

Further, each of the column electrodes W1 to Wm is regarded as a column electrode Wj, as recited at page 17, lines 19-23 of the specification where the first embodiment is explained and as shown in Figure 1. However, at page 20, lines 16-19 explaining the same first embodiment, it is expressly recited that all column electrodes Wj and Wm+1-j connected to the IC182 in common correspond to strip portions of an address electrode. That is, in the first embodiment, it is indicated that two column electrodes Wj and Wm+1-j out of column electrodes W1 to Wm belong to one address electrode, and are connected in common. As it is expressly recited at page 17, lines 20 and 21 that j=1 to m, each of the pairs of column electrodes (W1, Wm), (W2, Wm-1)... (Wm/2, Wm/2+1) belongs to the respective one address electrode.

Application No: 09/684,61

Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2003

The outstanding Office Action also indicates that the third embodiment does not expressly disclose the feature (ii) "applying a first voltage ... discharge cell" in independent Claim 1, lines 16-19 and independent Claim 10, lines 18-21. However, at page 38, line 25 through page 39, line 8 of the specification where the third embodiment is explained, it is expressly recited that "according to the plasma display device 70, the driving methods according to the aforementioned embodiments 1 and 2 can be applied. In the AC-PDP 71 or 71A, The generic term for all row electrodes X1 to Xn corresponds to 'scan electrode' while the generic term for all row electrode Y1 to Yn corresponds to 'sustain electrode,' and each of the row electrodes X1 to Xn and Y1 to Yn corresponds to a strip electrode of each electrode." Accordingly, the feature (ii) is expressly disclosed in a third embodiment.

The outstanding Office Action also indicates that if a scan electrode includes t strip portions, a sustain electrode must include 2t strip portions. However, as explained at page 20, line 23 to page 21, line 6 of the specification, because pairs Xi1 and YLi1, and Xi2 and YRi2 are formed, there is no necessity for a sustain electrode to include 2t strip portions if a scan electrode includes t strip portions as indicated by the outstanding Office Action.

Further, note page 20, line 20 recites that "i2 ≠ i1."

Accordingly, in light of the above comments, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Kamazawa et al.</u> in view of <u>Ryan et al.</u> This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The recitation of <u>Ryan et al.</u> in the first column, lines 55-59 to which the outstanding Office Action refers to merely states that "such a method of addressing requires a separate addressing circuit for each electrode or a multiplexed addressing circuit in which a group of electrodes are connected to a common addressing circuit." That is, <u>Ryan et al.</u> merely

indicate that every electrode in a group is connected to the same circuit, and do not indicate that electrodes are electrically connected in common as claimed in Claim 1.

Further, although it appears that a plurality of electrodes are connected to each of terminals +P1, +P2 and +P3 of a phase shift voltage generator 12, there exists an addressing electrode 16 aside from the electrodes. Therefore, although the outstanding Office Action indicates Ryan et al.'s strip portions of the address electrode are connected to an output terminal of a driving unit in common was well-known (see page 5, lines 12-14 of the Office Action), such indication is an improper inference because the structure as mentioned above is contrary to the structure employed in the addressing electrode of Ryan et al. Kanazawa et al. also do not teach or suggest the features recited in Claim 1.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AAPA. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Figure 10 showing the AAPA, a discharge gap DG and a non-discharge gap NG extend in a direction parallel with a direction that barrier ribs 111 extend. Accordingly, if discharge cells and non-discharge cells are arranged adjacently to each other in a direction parallel to a display line as indicated by the outstanding Office Action (see page 6, lines 16-18 in the Office Action), the display line extends in a direction that the barrier ribs 111 extend. However, Claim 9 expressly recites that the barrier ribs separate the non-discharge cells from the discharge cells at least along a direction intersecting with the display line (Claim 9, second paragraph). Accordingly, the relationship between the display line and the barrier ribs as recited in Claim 9 is not shown in Figure 10.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Application No: 09/684,61

Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2003

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599 David A. Bilodeau

Registration No. 42,325

22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413-2220

GJM/DAB/kst

I:\atty\DAB\198427us-am.doc